REMARKS

Introduction

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1-19, 75 and 76 are allowed. Applicant further notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 74 and 75 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-20, 22, 23, 26-31, 34, 35, 52, 54 and 76 are pending. Claims 20, 22, 23, 26, 28, 34, 35 and 52 have been amended. Claims 40, 41, 47, 49, 55-61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69-75, 77-80 have been cancelled. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

1. Rejection under 35 USC §112, paragraph 1

Claims 20, 22, 23, 26-31, 34, 40, 41, 47, 49, 52-61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69-72, 74, 77 and 79-80 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

a. Claim 20

On page 3 of the Office Action mailed on January 13, 2009 (hereinafter, "Office Action"), the Examiner alleges that "generating a mode signal indicating a rotated state of the screen body according to manipulation of a key to indicate the rotated state of the screen body" has no support from the specification. However, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the limitations recited in this claim are adequately supported by the specification for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully points out that independent claim 20 has been amended to recite,

among other things, "generating a pivot control signal to be supplied to a pivot circuit so as to display the OSD image suitable to the rotated state of the rotatable screen body." Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to Col. 6, lines 20-25 of the Applicant's specification, which describe the generation of a pivot control signal by controller 200. As described therein, if a mode control signal is generated by the manipulation of a key by a user, "then the controller 200 supplies a pivot control signal 212 to the pivot circuit 800 so as to display an on-screen display suitable to the turned status of the display panel 1100."

Thus, while claim 20 is not particularly limited to the embodiments of the invention recited in the portions of the specification cited above, Col. 6, lines 20-25 provide sufficient support for this claim to satisfy all of the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this claim is adequately supported by the specification and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

b. Claims 22, 23 and 26-31

It is respectfully submitted that these claims depend from Applicant's independent claim 20, for which sufficient support is provided to satisfy all of the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as pointed out above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides sufficient support for claims 22, 23 and 26-31 to satisfy all of the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant submits that these claims are adequately supported by the specification, and reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is earnestly solicited.

c. Claim 34

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that

> receiving an externally input video signal having a second image; displaying the second image; modifying OSD data corresponding to the first image including the OSD with respect to a position of the rotatable screen when the screen is rotated, according to a key manipulation to indicate the position of the rotatable screen; and displaying the first image that corresponds to the modified OSD data on the second image displayed on the rotatable screen,

has no support from the specification. However, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the limitations recited in this claim are adequately supported by the specification for at least the following reasons.

With respect to "receiving externally input video signals having a picture," Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to Col. 5, lines 52-58 and Fig. 3, which describe incoming RGB signals.

With respect to "modifying OSD data corresponding to the OSD image including the OSD with respect to the pivot control signal," Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to Col. 6, lines 10-25, which describe supplying a pivot control signal.

With respect to "displaying the OSD image that corresponds to the modified OSD data on the converted picture displayed on the rotatable screen," Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to Col. 6, lines 10-25 and Col. 7, lines 39-50, which describe supplying a pivot control signal and converting RBG signals.

Thus, while claim 34 is not particularly limited to the embodiments of the invention recited in the portions of the specification cited above, Col. 5, lines 52-58, Col. 6, lines 10-25 and Col. 7, lines 39-50 provide sufficient support for this claim to satisfy all of the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this claim is adequately supported by the specification and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

d. Claim 35

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that "a controller to generate a mode signal indicating a rotated state of the screen body according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate a rotated position of the screen body" is not supported by the specification.

Applicant respectfully points out that independent claim 20 has been amended to recite, among other things, "a controller to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to the rotated state of the rotatable body." Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's

attention to Col. 6, lines 20-25 of the Applicant's specification, which describe the generation of a pivot control signal 212 by controller 200. As described therein, if a mode control signal is generated by the manipulation of a key by a user, "then the controller 200 supplies a pivot control signal 212 to the pivot circuit 800 so as to display an on-screen display suitable to the turned status of the display panel 1100."

Thus, while claim 35 is not particularly limited to the embodiments of the invention recited in the portions of the specification cited above, Col. 6, lines 20-25 provide sufficient support for this claim to satisfy all of the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this claim is adequately supported by the specification and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

e. Claim 52

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that "a control unit to generate at least one of a mode signal indicating a rotated state of the display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate the rotated state of the display unit" is not supported by the specification.

Applicant respectfully points out that independent claim 52 has been amended to recite, among other things, "a control unit to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to the rotated state of the rotatable display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate the rotated state of the display unit and request an OSD, respectively." Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to Col. 6, lines 1-25 of the Applicant's specification, which describe the generation of an OSD control signal by controller 200, and the generation of a pivot control signal 212 by controller 200.

Thus, while claim 52 is not particularly limited to the embodiments of the invention recited in the portions of the specification cited above, Col. 6, lines 1-25 provide sufficient support for this claim to satisfy all of the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant submits this claim is adequately supported by the specification and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

f. Claim 54

It is respectfully submitted that claim 54 depends from Applicant's independent claim 52, for which sufficient support is provided to satisfy all of the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as pointed out above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides sufficient support for claim 54 to satisfy all of the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this claim is adequately supported by the specification, and reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly solicited.

g. Claims 40, 41, 47, and 53

With respect to the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, Applicant respectfully points out that these claims have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot.

2. Rejection under 35 USC §112, paragraph 2

Claim 80 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully points out that claim 80 has been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot.

3. Rejection under 35 USC §103(a): Kishimoto and Alioshin

Claim 78 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,134,390 to Kishimoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,986,634 to Alioshin et al.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 78 has been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot.

4. Rejection under 35 USC §103(a): Kishimoto and Register

Claims 34-35, 47, 52, 54-56, 61, 63, 64, 67, 73 and 79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,661,632 to Register. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claims 34 and 35

Regarding Applicant's independent claim 34, on pages 7-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Kishimoto discloses most of the features recited in independent claim 34, except that the Examiner admits, and Applicant agrees, that Kishimoto does not disclose "the image signal is from external and rotating an OSD 'according to a key manipulation to indicate the position of the rotatable screen' and 'wherein the key is located on a screen body." The Examiner then cites Register alleging that it discloses "image signals could be generated from external (Fig. 6, items 110, 112, 114, and 116) and a method of rotating an OSD in which it is rotated by a key located on the screen body (col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 4, where 54a and 54b are considered an OSD)." The Examiner also alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Register into Kishimoto because Kishimoto discloses a method of displaying an image and Register discloses manipulation of the OSD can be done by a key located on a displaying for the purpose of making a device more compact."

Regarding Applicant's independent claim 35, on pages 9-11 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Kishimoto discloses most of the features recited in independent claim 35, except that the Examiner admits, and Applicant agrees, that Kishimoto does not disclose "the image signal is from external and rotating an OSD 'according to a key manipulation to indicate the position of the rotatable screen' and 'wherein the key is located on a screen body." The Examiner then cites Register alleging that it discloses "a method of rotating an OSD in which image signals could be from external (Fig. 6, items 110, 112, 114, and 116) and the OSD is rotated by a key located on the screen body (col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 4, where 54a and 54b are considered OSD)." The Examiner also alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Register into Kishimoto because Kishimoto discloses a method of displaying an image and Register discloses manipulation of the OSD can be done by a key located on a displaying for the purpose of making a device more compact."

In contrast with the Examiner's allegations, Kishimoto does not teach or suggest "generating a pivot control signal" nor "converting scales of the input video signals" as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 34. Kishimoto merely describes that an image control unit 8 controls the display of image data on a display 11. (*See* Kishimoto, Col. 3, lines 42-49.) However, Kishimoto does not describe at any point where input video signals are converted to correspond to display characteristics of a screen. More specifically, Kishimoto does not describe at any point where scales of input video signals are converted to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen. In fact, the Examiner admits in the Office Action that Kishimoto does not disclose receiving an external video signal. Accordingly, Kishimoto does not teach or suggest, among other things, "converting scales of the input video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 34. Furthermore, Kishimoto also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a converter to receive externally input video signals having a picture and to convert scales of the input video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen body," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 35.

Also, since Kishimoto does not describe at any point "converting scales of input video signals," as pointed out above, Kishimoto also does not describe displaying converted external image signals. Accordingly, Kishimoto also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "displaying the OSD image that corresponds to the modified OSD data on the converted picture displayed on the rotatable screen," as presently recited in independent claim 34. Similarly, Kishimoto also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a circuit unit to display the picture of the externally inputted video signals on the screen body and to display the OSD image at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal on the displayed picture," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 35.

Further regarding Kishimoto, the Examiner alleges on page 8 of the Office Action that

"since the OSD 66 and 69 are at different positions in relation to picture images 65, they inherently indicate a rotated screen." (*See* Office Action, page 8.) However, Applicant's claim 34 recites, among other things, "generating a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable screen body." A similar distinction exists with respect to the Examiner's statement that "the control level could also be considered an indication." The "inherent indication" of Kishimoto alleged by the Examiner is thus distinguishable from the recitation of Applicant's independent claim 34. Furthermore, Kishimoto merely describes that a user may rotate the display 11 with a manipulation of a keyboard 2. However, this is distinctly different from "generating a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable screen body," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 34. This is also distinctly different from "a controller to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable body," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 35.

In addition, Register fails to remedy any of the deficiencies as pointed out above regarding Kishimoto. Register only describes displaying a screen image 52 in a display screen 26. However, Fig. 6 of Register, as relied on by the Examiner, only illustrates that a CPU 100 and items such as a PCMCIA card 110, a fax modem 112, and an I/O device 116 can communicate over a system bus 118. However, Register does not describe at any point where input video signals are converted to correspond to display characteristics of a screen, such as display screen 26. More specifically, Register does not describe at any point where scales of input video signals are converted to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of a screen. Accordingly, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "converting scales of the input video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 34. Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a converter to receive externally input video signals having a picture and to convert scales of the input video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen body," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 35.

Furthermore, Register merely describes that toggle buttons 28, 30, 32 and 34 may be

used to rotate a screen image 52 in a display screen 26 of a personal digital assistant. (*See* Register, Col. 3, line 65-Col. 4, line 4.) However, col. 3, line 65-col.4 , line 4 of Register, as relied on by the Examiner, merely describes that the orientation of the screen image 52 may be toggled by a user. Register also only describes that command icons 54a and 54b are displayed at a side of the image 52 in the display screen 26. Since, as pointed out above, Register does not describe "converting scales of the input video signal," and since Register also only describes that command icons 54a and 54b are displayed along a side of a displayed image, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "displaying the OSD image that corresponds to the modified OSD data on the converted picture displayed on the rotatable screen," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 34. Similarly, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a circuit unit to display the picture of the externally inputted video signals on the screen body and to display the OSD image at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal on the displayed picture," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 35.

Moreover, Register does not describe at any point where a "pivot control signal" is generated to display an on-screen display "suitable to a rotated state" of a "rotatable screen body," since Register merely describes allowing a user to use toggle buttons to rotate a screen image, and does not describe how a "pivot control signal" is generated to display an OSD "suitable to a rotated state" of a "rotatable screen body." Accordingly, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "generating a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable screen body," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 34. Further, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a controller to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable body," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 35.

Since Kishimoto and Register, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest each of the elements as recited in Applicant's independent claims 34 and 35, these claims are patentably distinguishable over Kishimoto and Register and are therefore deemed allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Claim 52

On pages 11-13 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Kishimoto discloses most of the features recited in independent claim 52, except that the Examiner admits, and Applicant agrees, that Kishimoto does not disclose "the image signal could be from external and 'wherein the display unit comprises one or more function keys to change the operation settings thereof by indicating the rotated state of the display unit such that the circuit unit drives the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal in response to a selection of the one or more function keys'." The Examiner then cites Register alleging that it discloses "a method of rotating an OSD in which the image signal could be from external (Fig. 6, items 110, 112, 114, and 116) and the OSD is rotated by a key located on the screen body (col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 4, where 54a and 54b are considered an OSD)." The Examiner also alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Register into Kishimoto because Kishimoto discloses a method of displaying an image and Register discloses manipulation of the OSD can be done by a key located on a displaying for the purpose of making a device more compact."

In contrast with the Examiner's allegations, col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4 of Kishimoto, as relied on by the Examiner, only describes that a user may press a key on a keyboard 2 to activate a motor and physically rotate display 11. The Examiner alleges on page 12 of the Office Action that "since the OSD 66 and 69 are at different positions in relation to picture images 65, they inherently indicate a rotated screen." However, Applicant's independent claim 52 recites, among other things, "a control unit to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate the rotated state of the display unit and request an OSD." A similar distinction exists with respect to the Examiner's statement that "the control level could also be considered an indication." The "inherent indication" of Kishimoto alleged by the Examiner is thus distinguishable from the recitation of Applicant's independent claim 52. Accordingly, Kishimoto does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a control unit to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to

indicate the rotated state of the display unit and request an OSD," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 52. Similarly, Kishimoto also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a circuit unit to drive the display unit to display the external image signal and to drive the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal generated by the control unit," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 52.

In addition, Register fails to remedy any of the deficiencies as pointed out above regarding Kishimoto. Register merely describes that toggle buttons 28, 30, 32 and 34 may be used to rotate a screen image 52 in a display screen 26 of a personal digital assistant. (*See* Register, Col. 3, line 65-Col. 4, line 4.) However, col. 3, line 65-col.4 , line 4 of Register, as relied on by the Examiner, merely describes that the orientation of the screen image 52 may be toggled by a user. Register also only describes that command icons 54a and 54b are displayed at a side of the image 52 in the display screen 26 -- Register does not describe at any point where an OSD can be requested by a user. Furthermore, Register does not describe at any point where a "pivot control signal" is generated to display an on-screen display "suitable to a rotated state" of a "rotatable screen body," since Register merely describes allowing a user to use toggle buttons to rotate a screen image, and does not describe how a "pivot control signal" is generated to display an OSD "suitable to a rotated state" of a "rotatable screen body." Accordingly, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a control unit to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate the rotated state of the display unit and request an OSD," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 52. Similarly, since Register does not describe generating a "pivot control signal" and an "OSD driving signal" according to a key manipulation by a user, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "a circuit unit to drive the display unit to display the external image signal and to drive the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal generated by the control unit," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 52.

Since Kishimoto and Register, whether taken alone or in combination with one another,

fail to teach or suggest each of the elements as recited in Applicant's independent claim 52, this claim is patentably distinguishable over Kishimoto and Register and is therefore deemed allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejections and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Claim 54

It is respectfully submitted that claim 54 depends from independent claim 52, which is patentably distinguishable from Kishimoto and Register for at least the reasons provided above. Therefore, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in independent claim 52, dependent claim 54 is also allowable over Kishimoto and Register, whether taken alone or in combination with one another. Accordingly, claim 54 is allowable over Kishimoto and Register, either separately or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Claims 47, 55, 56, 61, 63, 64, 67, 73 and 79

Applicant respectfully points out that claims 47, 55, 56, 61, 63, 64, 67, 73 and 79 have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot.

5. Rejection under 35 USC §103(a): Kishimoto, Register and Ishii

Claims 20, 22-23, 26-29, 40, 41, 66, 69, 71 and 72 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto in view of Register and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,639,603 to Ishii.

Claim 20

Regarding Applicant's independent claim 20, on pages 15-17 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Kishimoto discloses most of the features recited in independent claim 20, except that the Examiner admits, and Applicant agrees, that Kishimoto does not disclose "the

image signal could be from external and rotating an OSD 'according to a key manipulation to indicate the position of the rotatable screen' and 'wherein the key is located on a screen body." The Examiner then cites Register alleging that it discloses "the image signal could be generated from external (Fig. 6, items 110, 112, 114, and 116) the OSD is rotated by a key located on the screen body (col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 4, where 54a and 54b are considered an OSD)." The Examiner also alleges that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Register into Kishimoto because Kishimoto discloses a method of displaying an image and Register discloses manipulation of the OSD can be done by a key located on a displaying for the purpose of making a device more compact."

The Examiner further admits, and Applicants agree, that neither Kishimoto nor Register disclose "the video signals could be colored." The Examiner then alleges that Ishii discloses "a displaying method in which color video signals could be inputted."

In contrast with the Examiner's allegations, Kishimoto does not teach or suggest "generating a pivot control signal" nor "converting scales of externally input color component video signals" as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 20. Kishimoto merely describes that an image control unit 8 controls the display of image data on a display 11 to determine the display position, magnification and display format of image data. (*See* Kishimoto, Col. 3, lines 42-49.) However, Kishimoto does not describe at any point where input video signals are converted to correspond to display characteristics of a screen. More specifically, Kishimoto does not describe at any point where scales of input video signals are converted to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen. In fact, the Examiner admits in the Office Action that Kishimoto does not disclose receiving external color video signals. Accordingly, Kishimoto does not teach or suggest, among other things, "converting scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 20.

Also, since Kishimoto does not describe at any point "converting scales of externally input color component video signals," as pointed out above, Kishimoto also does not describe displaying converted external image signals. Accordingly, Kishimoto also does not teach or

suggest, among other things, "displaying a picture of the converted color component video signals on the screen body, and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture in accordance with the pivot control signal and the key manipulation," as presently recited in independent claim 20.

Further regarding Kishimoto, the Examiner alleges on page 16 of the Office Action that "since the OSD 66 and 69 are at different positions in relation to picture images 65, they inherently indicate a rotated screen." (*See* Office Action, page 8.) However, Applicant's claim 20 recites, among other things, "generating a pivot control signal to be supplied to a pivot circuit so as to display the OSD image suitable to the rotated state of the rotatable screen body." A similar distinction exists with respect to the Examiner's statement that "the control level could also be considered an indication." The "inherent indication" of Kishimoto alleged by the Examiner is thus distinguishable from the recitation of Applicant's independent claim 20. Furthermore, Kishimoto merely describes that a user may rotate the display 11 with a manipulation of a keyboard 2. However, this is distinctly different from "generating a pivot control signal to be supplied to a pivot circuit so as to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable screen body," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 20.

In addition, Register fails to remedy any of the deficiencies as pointed out above regarding Kishimoto. Register only describes displaying a screen image 52 in a display screen 26. However, Fig. 6 of Register, as relied on by the Examiner, only illustrates that a CPU 100 and items such as a PCMCIA card 110, a fax modem 112, and an I/O device 116 can communicate over a system bus 118. However, Register does not describe at any point where input video signals are converted to correspond to display characteristics of a screen, such as display screen 26. More specifically, Register does not describe at any point where scales of input video signals are converted to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of a screen. Accordingly, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "converting scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 20.

Furthermore, Register merely describes that toggle buttons 28, 30, 32 and 34 may be used to rotate a screen image 52 in a display screen 26 of a personal digital assistant. (*See* Register, Col. 3, line 65-Col. 4, line 4.) However, col. 3, line 65-col.4 , line 4 of Register, as relied on by the Examiner, merely describes that the orientation of the screen image 52 may be toggled by a user. Register also only describes that command icons 54a and 54b are displayed at a side of the image 52 in the display screen 26. Since, as pointed out above, Register does not describe "converting scales of the input video signal," and since Register also only describes that command icons 54a and 54b are displayed along a side of a displayed image, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "displaying a picture of the converted color component video signals on the screen body, and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture in accordance with the pivot control signal and the key manipulation-," as presently recited in Applicant's independent claim 20.

Moreover, Register does not describe at any point where a "pivot control signal" is generated to display an on-screen display "suitable to a rotated state" of a "rotatable screen body," since Register merely describes allowing a user to use toggle buttons to rotate a screen image, and does not describe how a "pivot control signal" is generated to display an OSD "suitable to a rotated state" of a "rotatable screen body." Accordingly, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "generating a pivot control signal to be supplied to a pivot circuit so as to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable screen body," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 34.

In addition, the Examiner cites Ishii merely to allege that it discloses "a displaying method in which color video signals could be inputted." However, Ishii does not remedy any of the deficiencies as pointed out above regarding Kishimoto and Register. For example, Ishii does not describe at any point "converting scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20. Ishii also does not describe at any point "displaying a picture of the converted color component video signals on the screen body, and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture in accordance with the pivot control signal and the key manipulation," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20. Furthermore, Ishii

also does not describe at any point "generating a pivot control signal to be supplied to a pivot circuit so as to display the OSD image suitable to the rotated state of the rotatable screen body," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20.

Since Kishimoto, Register, and Ishii, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest each of the elements as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20, this claim is patentably distinguishable over Kishimoto, Register, and Ishii, and is therefore deemed allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Claims 22-23, 26-29

It is respectfully submitted that claims 22-23, 26-29 depend from independent claim 20, which is patentably distinguishable from Kishimoto, Register and Ishii for at least the reasons provided above. Therefore, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in independent claim 20, dependent claims 22-23, 26-29 are also allowable over Kishimoto, Register and Ishii, whether taken alone or in combination with one another. Accordingly, claims 22-23, 26-29 are allowable over Kishimoto, Register and Ishii, either separately or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Claims 40, 41, 66, 69, 71 and 72

Applicant respectfully points out that claims 40, 41, 66, 69, 71 and 72 have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot.

6. Rejection under 35 USC §103(a): Kishimoto, Register, Ishii, and Sakamoto

Claims 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto, Register, Ishii, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,329,289 to Sakamoto.

With respect to claims 30 and 31, it is respectfully submitted that these claims depend from independent claim 20, which is allowable over Kishimoto, Register and Ishii for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in claim 20, dependent claims 30 and 31 are also allowable over Kishimoto, Register and Ishii, either individually or combined. Further, since the Examiner cites Sakamoto merely to allege it discloses "reading OSD data contained in the OSD image as first OSD data; and modifying the first OSD data as second OSD data according to the generated mode signal," Sakamoto does not teach or suggest the limitations of these claims which are lacking in Kishimoto, Register and Ishii. For example, Sakamoto does not describe at any point "converting scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20. Sakamoto also does not describe at any point "displaying a picture of the converted color component video signals on the screen body, and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture in accordance with the pivot control signal and the key manipulation," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20. Furthermore, Sakamoto also does not describe at any point "generating a pivot control signal to be supplied to a pivot circuit so as to display the OSD image suitable to the rotated state of the rotatable screen body," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20.

Therefore, claims 30 and 31 are allowable over Kishimoto , Register, Ishii and Sakamoto, either separately or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

7. Rejection under 35 USC §103(a): Kishimoto, Register, Ishii, and Wehmeyer

Claims 57, 59 and 70 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto, Register, Ishii, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,543,857 to Wehmeyer.

Applicants respectfully point out that claims 57, 59 and 70 have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot.

8. Rejection under 35 USC §103(a): Kishimoto, Register, Ishii, Wehmeyer and Aloishin

Claims 58 and 60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto, Register, Ishii, and Wehmeyer, and further in view Aloishin.

Applicants respectfully point out that claims 58 and 60 have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to out Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: April 13, 2009

By: _____
David Hyams
Registration No. 50,947

919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901